



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Professor E. K. Rand, of Harvard University, deals with *The Classics in European Education*, from Greek and Roman times (260-282). Though professedly only historical, aiming to show to what extent and in what manner the Classics have been (wrongly and rightly) studied, the paper gives a fine presentation of the claims of the Classics to a consideration even to-day in every scheme of education, because everywhere Professor Rand makes it clear that "the true progress of humanism, which is nothing but the ancient program revived, has always pointed men to the treasured ideals of the past and inspired them to action in the present" (282). As long ago as Pericles's time, when the great (Greek) Classic, Homer, was part and parcel of Greek education, "we see the twofold impulse of the human spirit which the study of classical literature normally inspires—reverence for the past, and the passionate desire to act worthily in the present" (260). There is an instructive discussion of the attitude of the Church toward pagan culture. After this comes a discussion of Dante's attitude toward antiquity (264 ff.), and of the study of the Classics, Greek and Latin both, by the humanists (267 ff.). The programme of the humanists after Greek had its sure place there may be seen in Battisto Guarino's *De Ordine docendi et studendi* (1459). The programme contains nothing but Latin and Greek (270);

. . . it is simply the ancient method of Cicero and Quintilian all over again. Both authors are constantly cited for principles as well as facts; *virtutis laus omnis in actione consistit*, said Cicero, and Vittorino echoes the words. Second, it is the basis of every truly humanistic program established from that day to this. Its principles appear in some dozen treatises of the day, and from Italy spread to the North. What I have quoted does not touch all the elements in humanistic education. Science and mathematics received more consideration than one might suppose. Religious training was not neglected, as it is with us; polite demeanor, dress, physical exercise, all were matters for attention. And let me emphasize again the point I would specially make: the twofold character of their education, its reverence for the past and its interest in the present, derives clearly from the ancient prototype.

Rudolphus Agricola, Vivès, Dorat, Budé, Erasmus, Thomas Elyot, "who interpreted Erasmus and Budé to England" (271), Ascham, Bacon, Milton are all in turn considered.

Attention is then given (273 ff.) to various forces that tended to discredit the educational programme based on the Classics. These include the decay of the method itself, due especially to too rigid restriction of Latin style to Ciceronianism¹, the Protestant Reformation, the famous quarrel between the ancients and the moderns which spread from

France to England, romanticism, German ways of studying the Classics, etc. There is a pertinent query at the close of the paper (282):

Further, I would inquire, how have we teachers of the classics fulfilled our tasks? Have we always kept before us the true ideal of humanism? Have we made the sacred past living and contemporary, or have we banished our subject to a timeless district, illumined, not by the dry light of reason, which is a wholesome effluence, but by the dry darkness of the unprofitable?

To sum up, the book contains much of importance for all classes of readers. It does, to be sure, virtually nothing for the pedagogical side of the Classics. But it states in most suggestive ways, in papers that cross one another frequently, yet have sufficient individuality, the claims of the Classics to a large place in American education. To the non-classical reader the testimony of so many men of parts not in any way concerned with the direct professional use of the Classics should have weight; to the teacher of the Classics the book sounds a call to higher service to his pupils and to his age, by urging him to prepare himself better in his subject and to teach it better by taking a larger and broader view of it, correlating the present and the past, and above all, by being himself, as the result of his classical and humanistic studies, in every way more truly *homo, immo vero vir*. C. K.

THE OLD EDUCATION AND THE NEW¹

Of all the branches of study pursued in school, Latin and Greek have left their marks deepest on the character of education. For many ages, Greek and Latin with Mathematics were the foundations of a liberal education, nay rather, they *were* a liberal education. They were the trivium of the Middle Ages and of later times. No man was considered an educated man who had not devoted years to the study of these subjects and whose mind had not been trained by long-continued pursuit of these branches. That in many cases they were poorly taught, that in many cases the results were not at all commensurate with the time that had been devoted to them, that after years of study there was a woeful ignorance of both Greek and Latin literature and that the knowledge of Mathematics was insufficient to solve the problem of how to make both ends meet were facts seized upon by the ever-ready innovator and were made by him the excuse for a change to more 'practical' subjects and to those which were nearer to the every-day life of the world. With a great blowing of trumpets and beating of drums the Modern Languages and Science, 'the great panacea for all the educational ills of the past', as their advocates claimed, were

¹ See Sandys's chapter, *The History of Ciceronianism* in *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning*, 145-173.

¹ This paper was read at the organization meeting of The Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest, held at Portland, Oregon, June 16-17, 1911.

introduced to supplant the Classics and Mathematics, and to drive them from their lofty places in the educational Pantheon.

'The New Education', as it has been called, has been in power for some time, long enough, indeed, to bring forth fruit capable of being weighed in the balance in which the old was weighed and of being tested by the same standards by which the old education was tried. Let us consider what these results are.

Those of us who are engaged in teaching in secondary schools are not in the best position to test the results of our work. We are too near it. For the tests of our work we must look to the colleges and so we must ask those who have the task of examining students when they present themselves for matriculation, before the college has had an opportunity of making its impress upon the students, to examine the results for us.

Those who are in positions such as I have mentioned above do not hesitate to publish over their signatures statements that the results are not only far from satisfactory, but that the students who have been trained wholly or almost exclusively in the Modern Languages and Science are far inferior to those of former years, whose mental pabulum was almost exclusively the Classics and Mathematics. In a recent Magazine article Professor Barrett Wendell of Harvard says, "Year after year, it seems to me, as the newer educational notions have supplanted the elder at schools which fit boys for college, those boys prove, when they get to college, flabbier and flabbier in mind".

Dean Briggs, also of Harvard, in his book on College, School, and Character, says the same thing about the mental character of those who were fed on the "soft food" of the new education. Many others have confirmed this statement.

While it was true that the boy of the preceding generation, or rather, I should say, of our generation, did not know much, yet he had received a certain mental training that enabled him to grapple with the more difficult subjects of the college curriculum with an energy and an earnestness of purpose which seem to be lacking in the college students of to-day, who have been trained by the easier methods of the Modern Languages and the Sciences.

"Education", it has been said, "is a matter partly of information and partly of training". According to my idea, the latter phase is the more important. An educated man distinguishes himself from an uneducated one not so much by the amount of information he may possess on any subject as by the fact that his faculties are under better control. When new or unexpected conditions confront an educated man, owing to his superior mental training, he can use his wits better, or, in other words, when put to the task he can accomplish something.

He has learned to devote his attention to the matter in hand, even though it may not interest him in itself. His faculty of voluntary attention as distinguished from spontaneous attention has been trained and developed, while that of an uneducated man has not been trained in the same manner, and the latter finds that he is unable to concentrate his attention on an irksome or uninviting task with sufficient energy and for a long enough time to accomplish anything.

"The faculty of voluntary attention", says Professor Wendell, "clearly distinguished the college students of thirty years ago from the flabbier students of to-day. And that faculty the older students gained largely from the elder system of education to which they were forced to submit. And no one, I believe, can gain it in any thing like the same degree from methods as yet devised by apostles of the modern education". Unknowingly the old education cultivated this faculty well. Through daily hours, throughout all their youthful years, it compelled the boys, in spite of every human reluctance, to fix their attention on matters which of themselves could never have held attention for five minutes together¹.

Latin and Greek also are among the most valuable studies for training in logical method. While not the superiors of the experimental sciences in that they do not permit the use of the most valuable of inductive devices, experiment, yet we may, nay rather, we should make inductions by drawing conclusions from a multitude of instances. But the most valuable form of mental gymnastics provided by the systematic and careful study of the Classics is the setting of authorities one against another and the deduction of interpretations from ascertained rules of syntax. As a training in the honest weighing of evidence, the solving of a problem in translation or the interpretation of a Greek or Latin text is of the highest value.

But the Classics can further lay claim to a unique power of developing precision of thought. A great deal of the business of life depends on our being precise in the meanings which we attach to words. The evils of ambiguity in language appear to be most easily and naturally avoided by the careful cultivation of the precise and honest rendering of a Latin or Greek passage in the light of all the evidence that can be collected for its interpretation.

By training to exactness and precision of speech, translation trains to exactness and precision of thought. In translating a pupil must examine every word with critical care to determine just what it means, and to find a word in his own language which will exactly express the thought. In ferreting out the hidden meaning of a sentence he must see

¹ See the quotations from Professor Wendell in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.225-226.

the connection between all the words and the specific ideas which they denote, and as a final act he must put the whole thing over into another language. In doing this he makes the thought of the author his own; he lives over the experiences of the writer; he grows into possession of all the author possesses. 'But', you may say, 'do not the Modern Languages do this?' Yes, they do, to a certain extent, and in such a degree are they valuable for mental discipline as well as for culture. But they are inferior to Greek and Latin owing to the fact that they have not the elaborate inflectional system of the Classics and their principles of syntax too closely resemble those of English.

Another reason why the Modern Languages are inferior to the Classics for educational purposes is in the character of their literatures. The literatures of the Modern Languages are based largely on those of the Greeks and the Romans. They are lacking, however, in those elemental qualities that distinguish the literatures of Greece and Rome, simplicity and richness. As instruments of education the literatures of Greece and Rome are valuable on these two grounds. The great primitive masterpieces that have served as models for two or three thousand years are necessarily nearer, as a rule, to the appreciation of young people who are to be trained to understand and like literature than the more elaborate compositions of later days; and they have the incomparable advantage of being mostly the true and spontaneous expression of their time. They are at once the means of cultivating taste and also first-hand documents of history in which the pupils can make discoveries for themselves.

So far as richness is concerned, every one of the great departments of literary composition is represented by some noble classical exemplars. In point of poetry we have not yet improved on the classification of poetic composition which we owe to the Greeks; and in every kind of poetry the Greeks at least have done supremely well. In point of prose, Greek and Latin historians and philosophers are among the greatest of the great models and possessions for all time. It has been truly said that the "Romans were characterized by breadth of design, directness of purpose, vigor in devices for the attainment of practical ends, scrupulous thoroughness, and purity of execution, and that these characteristics remain stamped upon every work that they accomplished in engineering, literature, and art".

The study of Latin and Greek is valuable also as a key to the history of Western civilisation. The 'dead' languages of Greece and Rome are the unalterable records of the past, social, political, and religious. If we would know what our civilisation means, we must understand the nature of the contributions made by Greece and Rome. Of course

translations may be used; but the form and spirit are too closely united in literature to make translations more than a makeshift.

The study of Latin contributes in a remarkable degree to the mastery of English. Latin in an unusual way contributes to the mastery of content and consequent mastery of expression. If there is one thing that more than all else can be said in defence of Latin, it is that the language cannot be trifled with. The mastery of inflections and of the elementary rules for syntax opens a new field for most children; and one of the first lessons that is learned in any well-taught Latin class is that law and order must be respected, that what is not right is wrong.

Also, in the often painful mastery of the rules for accent, syllabication, and gender, in the mastery of declension, conjugation, and comparison, in applying the elementary rules for the relations of words in a Latin sentence,—in all this exacting work which must not be slighted not the least valuable lesson that can be learned is that a literary artist must serve an apprenticeship which is as exacting as that of anyone who hopes for power in other ways. There is no other way by which an English-speaking child can be taught this lesson so well as in the first few weeks of his study of Latin.

The Latin syntax is simple, direct, and lucid; yet it is full of perplexities to a child who has known no grammar save that of the English language. All sorts of methods have been tried to lighten the burden. But here is one place where hard, patient work must be insisted upon, if a knowledge of Latin is to be acquired; it is only by a thorough mastery of the Latin sentence that the study of Latin may contribute to the mastery of English. Two things, however, must be required by the teacher of every pupil if the study of Latin is to contribute to the knowledge of our English tongue: these are the formation of the habit of understanding the *precise* meaning of a Latin word, and the careful rendering of every passage into concise idiomatic English. If these things are neglected not only will Latin be of little help to the study of English, but it may prove to be a positive detriment.

It seems to me that we teachers of the Classics are to a certain extent responsible for the attack that has been made upon the former preeminence of our subjects in the educational scheme. In our efforts to introduce something new into our work, in our desire to try some innovations, we have weakened the force of our work and have laid ourselves open to attacks from our opponents. A few years ago the cry was, 'Let us have more translation at sight. If it is a good thing for a boy to read a few authors or a small portion of a few authors, why would it not be better to read larger

portions of many authors, and thus give the boy a more extensive acquaintance with the literatures of Greece and Rome'. The plea was specious and was listened to by many teachers; and those of us who were weary of the everlasting dividing of Gaul into three parts or of marching the Ten Thousand so many parasangs a day eagerly welcomed the opportunity of reading widely with our classes. The requirements of some of the Eastern colleges were changed from an examination on certain authors or portions of authors to sight translation entirely. Now I would not minimize the value of sight translation. On the contrary, I believe that the ability to translate at sight prose and poetry of average difficulty is the best test of a mastery of a language. But I *do* maintain that it is impossible with the average student in the four years that most preparatory schools give to the study of Latin to acquire a sufficiently copious vocabulary and the familiarity with the principles of syntax that is requisite for translation at sight without neglecting the careful intensive study of selected portions of well-chosen authors. And it is in such intensive study of selected portions that the greatest disciplinary value of the study of Greek and Latin lies.

The plan of extensive reading of the Classics in secondary schools has been tried and has proven a failure in most instances. To such an extent has this been recognized to be the case that Harvard has changed her entrance requirements again and now offers an examination on selected portions of chosen authors as the major requirement.

Let the student translate at sight as much as possible; but let that be a matter of secondary importance in the preparatory school, not an end in itself, for the primary aim of the preparatory course should not be *culture* but *discipline*.

FOREST GROVE, OREGON.

J. C. HAZZARD.

REVIEWS

The *Phaedo* of Plato. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by John Burnet. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1911). Pp. lix + 158.

One would have given much to be present at a Platonic symposium, easily conceivable, at which those brilliant twin stars in the study of Plato and his philosophy might have been present—James Adam of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and John Burnet, representing Oxford. Aberdeen did well when she sent the former to Cambridge to return later to her to deliver those lectures embodied in his *Religious Teachers of Greece*, after years devoted to the study of Platonic text and philosophy. Burnet, also a student of Plato, had turned at first towards Aristotle and edited the *Ethics* in 1900. Two years later his *Platonis Opera* made its appearance. The *Republic* came later, and, along with it,

his *Early Greek Philosophy*, second edition of which appeared in 1908. It may be easily surmised that a *Phaedo* from his hands will therefore show diligent collation of manuscripts and a well prepared text, with abundant variant readings. This is all true. The variants appear at the foot of each page, not being removed to the limbo of a critical appendix at the end of the book.

The Introduction covers fifty-five pages and is devoted throughout to the question how true a Socrates we get from the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, the *Discourses* of Socrates (as Aristotle, *Poet.* 1477 b 24 ff., calls Plato's *Dialogues*) and from Aristotle. This involves the deeper question, how much of the theory of the soul's immortality contained in the *Phaedo* is Plato's and how much the great Master's. Burnet does not follow the larger number of, Platonic scholars, who have held that Xenophon gives us the 'historic' Socrates and that Plato uses the teacher as the mouthpiece for his own views. It is not easy for him to believe that Plato intended his readers to regard the *Phaedo* simply as an imaginary conversation; it is to his mind the likeness of a great philosopher in the supreme crisis of his life, drawn by a philosopher who was greater still and was also one of the most consummate dramatic artists the world has known. It would have been, he thinks, an outrage on all natural piety if Plato had used the condemned Socrates as a mere mouthpiece for novel doctrines of his own. Burnet holds that the interpretation that finds nothing in the *Phaedo* but the speculations of Plato himself is based on the belief that the historic Socrates of whom we get some idea from Xenophon is quite a different person from the Platonic Socrates. This emphasis of Xenophon is apparently due to the authority of Hegel and his school. Against this view Burnet protests, and he sets about giving such an account of Xenophon's Socratic writings as makes the so-called historic Socrates appear as the fictitious character. Xenophon, he maintains, had no special information about Socrates; nor was he in any sense his real follower, as were Simmias and Cebes; he did not belong to the same circle as these men did and his sympathy with them was imperfect. The conversations in the *Memorabilia* were not held in his presence, and he had no opportunity of hearing about them from oral tradition, as Plato may have done in similar cases. We have the feeling that Xenophon got the substance of many of his conversations from what Wilamowitz calls the Socratic apocrypha, and fitted these as well as he could into his own recollections of the brave old man with the gift of second sight whose advice he had sought in early life. So, where he claims to have been an eye-witness, his statements are not to be trusted. He was eager to defend the memory